

RI WATER RESOURCES BOARD  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

**STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP  
ON WATER ALLOCATION  
PROCEEDINGS**

January 29, 2004

**1. Call to Order**

Mr. Dan Varin, Chairman, Rhode Island Water Resources Board (WRB) called the Strategic Committee meeting to order at 9:10. He welcomed participants to the meeting, and noted today's meeting will review the work and recommendations of the Water Allocation Program Committee (WAPAC) nine sub-committees. Mr. Varin stated that the objective of today's meeting is for the WRB members to fully understand and evaluate the recommendations and findings of this comprehensive and inclusive process prior to the February 10, 2004 WRB meeting. He noted that the effort to manage water as a natural resource is invaluable to the state. He then turned the meeting over to Ms. Kathy Crawley, Staff Director, WRB.

Ms. Kathy Crawley welcomed participants to today's meeting and noted the WAPAC has worked for over 18 months to bring together diverse opinions and diverse interests to reach some consensus on the 84 WAPAC recommendations. The "21 Priority" recommendations will be the focus of the meeting today. She stated the morning session will include a short presentation from each of the nine subcommittees. The afternoon session will present the opportunity for WRB Strategic Committee members to ask questions and receive comment on the WAPAC recommendations.

Briefly, Ms. Crawley reviewed the packet materials and provided an explanation of the WAPAC "top 21" recommendations. Participants attending today's meeting all received a packet of information on the WAPAC recommendations. Packet materials included:

- a. WAPAC Recommendations
- b. WAPAC Mission and Guiding Principles with Statutory Reference
- c. Committee Mission, Deliverables and Recommendations
- d. Thematic Findings
- e. Comment Sheet

She noted a comment sheet was available for participants to submit additional comments, recommendations or information to the WRB. Submitted comments will be used to structure the afternoon session that is designed primarily to provide the WRB with the opportunity to ask in-depth, technical questions of the committee leads and members. The afternoon session will also create the opportunity to engage in a dialogue with participants. She concluded by saying that there was a tremendous effort on the part of committee leads in preparation for today's session that includes maps and diagrams displayed throughout the room and a PowerPoint slide presentation to help define the scope and context of each recommendation.

## **II. Committee Presentations**

### **A. Education Committee**

#### **Dr. Sandra Whitehouse, Chair**

Dr. Sandra Whitehouse, Environmental Policy Advisor to the RI House of Representatives, reviewed the Education Committee recommendations. She reported that the purpose of the education and outreach program will be to encourage a mind set among water suppliers and the public on the value of the State's water resources. She noted there was a high level of agreement among all of the WAPAC members on the need to develop an education and outreach program that is part of the overall recommendations, and the effort will require a media effort and real dollars. The focus of the media strategy on water resources will include information and connection to the water resources as well as recycling and water reuse programs.

She stated that the committee will continue to make general presentations in the next few weeks to targeted audiences that include the Washington Regional Planning Council as well as the Chamber of Commerce. The committee plans to continue to use print media as well as the web to get the messages out. Implementation will require a dedicated FTE. She noted that the work of the committee is just beginning now that there are recommendations to work with.

### **B. Stream Flow Committee**

#### **Ms. Alicia Good, Chair**

Ms. Alicia Good, Assistant Director, Office of Water Resources, RI Department of Environmental Management presented the Stream Flow Committee report. She stated that the goal of the committee is to develop an inflow stream standard including site specific standards that allow for the maximum sustainable use of the state's waters, protecting biological, chemical and physical integrity of the waters. They recognize that this will take time and resources. In the interim a cognizant level approach is suggested. She noted that the US Fish and Wildlife standard (New England ABF) is the standard commonly used for a simple, desktop, cognizance level approach. The committee recommends that a RI ABF (Aquatic Base Flow) method be evaluated to address comments. The Department of Environmental Management (DEM) has completed their evaluation.

The second priority is maintaining and expanding the RI gaging system. Right now there are 20 gages, and the state cost shares with the USGS (DEM supporting 9 and the remainder support by the WRB). She noted that DEM may have difficulty maintaining the funding over the long term. Therefore, funding needs will be included in the committee recommendation as these figures become available. The committee recommendation is to have a continuous gage system in each of the 12 HUC areas that coincide with the 12 watershed areas. She stated there are 56 sub-watersheds in RI and a decision has not yet been made to how many or which watersheds to install stream gages. She referenced a USGS map delineating where there are existing and temporary gage station noting the need to identify criteria for evaluating where to put gages and evaluate the watershed. The committee plans to continue their work and plans to identify technical experts to assist in developing of a watershed specific protocol. She emphasized that maintaining the existing network is the top priority.

### **C. Water Use Reporting Committee**

#### **Dr. Anne Veeger, Chair**

Dr. Anne Veeger, Associate Professor, GeoSciences Department, University of Rhode Island, and Chairman of the Water Use Reporting Committee, presented the committee recommendations. She reported that the mission of the committee is to review water use data and identify any gaps, specifically in two pilot basins (Blackstone River Basin, and Pawcatuck River Basin) (and identify gaps about what we know about water use in those basins and come up with some sort of plan to identify what to do with those gaps). The committee evaluated sources of water use data available in RI, and discovered that

while there is a lot of information available from various state agencies – very few of those organizations collect volume information. The committee assessed the availability of data for public water withdrawals and self-supply withdrawals. The committee found on a statewide basis that the major water suppliers are required to report water withdrawals (85% of water withdrawals in the state). This information is not collected on an annual basis, broken down by month, or submitted by all of the water suppliers in the same year. Some water suppliers report by category and others do not. Therefore, it is very difficult to assemble statewide information. In essence, the committee recommends tracking a great infrastructure that is already in place to improve our ability to evaluate information statewide. Minor public suppliers are not required to submit data but USGS does collect information using water coefficients for determining water use estimates. The committee looked at estimation techniques for self suppliers of all categories, and in some cases the data was useful but for the most part the estimates were way off. For example, the estimates in the Pawcatuck were more than 40 % off the estimates. Therefore, there is a need for a variety of types of reporting to obtain the necessary information to fill the data gap. The committee has proposed a reporting system that includes the major suppliers, minor suppliers, and minor self suppliers. Therefore, the recommendation is major suppliers will be required to report monthly water withdrawal data on an annual basis. Over time, the reporting should be standardized on an annual calendar year basis. Major public suppliers should report water use by category on a quarterly basis using an annual time frame. This will take time to implement as it is dependent on the type of software system is being used and frequency of meter reading. Self-supply (includes minor water suppliers) users over a threshold of 3mg/y that is the same threshold currently in use by major water suppliers. It is recommended that this system be implemented on a voluntary basis by January 2005, and become mandatory by January 2007. The recommendation is not that all self-supply users be metered. Another approved method could be used for measuring water use including coefficients.

Funding will be required to receive, analyze and staff the data collection and management effort. This recommendation includes a funding component.

#### **D. Water/Wastewater Committee**

#### **Mr. Juan Mariscal, Chair**

Mr. Juan Mariscal, Committee Lead, and WRB staff member, presented the Water/Wastewater Committee report. He thanked committee members for their active participation, noting the committee purpose was best served by identifying a new source of water for the state of RI. Over the last several months the committee met with several groups who have implemented successful recycling water projects (Towns of Jamestown, Johnston). Mr. Mariscal noted there are many successful projects throughout the state that can be used to develop a new source of water. It is recommended that the promotion of recycling projects throughout the state occur in conjunction with Education and Outreach committee recommendations. It is further recommended that there be legislation and regulation put in place so that when a project exceeds a certain water use threshold, a developer would have to develop some sort of water reuse plan. This could also be included in a comprehensive planning requirement that would then minimize the stress placed on existing system. Another recommendation is that water reuse, reclamation, and recycling of stormwater, greywater, and wastewater be given comment within the states guide plan and other planning documents in the state as a viable, substantive, and alternative water source for the state. The committee felt that water reuse and recycling creates an opportunity and potential for the state of Rhode Island.

#### **E. Priority Uses Committee**

#### **Dr. Walter Combs, Chair**

Dr. Walter Combs, Executive Director, Environmental Health, RI Department of Health, and Co-Chair of the Priority Uses Committee presented the committee recommendations. He referred to a

handout (PowerPoint presentation slides) that he distributed to WRB members. Mr. Combs thanked the committee members, and others, for their participation and input into the work of the committee. He stated the committee mission was to develop a set of dynamic criteria developed to specific basin needs that would be used by the WRB in setting standards.

The committee worked on the assumption that the WRB would adopt a comprehensive water allocation program, and that the criteria would be applicable for both emergency and non-emergent situations, and that were based on consensus. State laws and policies for RI and other states were reviewed. The committee sought emphasis on fairness, equitable distribution and integration with all other plans of the state. Therefore, the committee recommendation is to provide preference but not exclusive use up to the safe yield for the following priorities: consumption, sanitation, and suppression of fire in so far as necessary to protect the public health and survival. The second priority is for uses necessary for survival of livestock and to preserve crops and physical plant. The third priority is to maximize employment and economic benefits. The overall committee recommendation is to look at the definition of safe yield because this is where the environment is protected. The other priorities, of course, are ones that need to be included. For example, priority uses should be made on a basin-by-basin basis.

At the conclusion of the committee presentation, Ms. Crawley called for a 15-minute break.

### **Break – 10:30 – 10:45 am**

### **Reconvene the Strategic Planning Committee**

Mr. Dan Varin reconvened the Strategic Planning Committee. He stated that five of the subcommittees had made their reports, and now the group would hear from the last four subcommittees. He pointed out that beyond the importance of the subject matter, participants are watching a demonstration of what the WRB should do. The WRB should bring together all of the critical interests on any water issue and those issues are certainly handled by various departments, organizations or individuals but they don't always get together to focus the necessary attention and effort on them. The one we are dealing with today, in my opinion, is the most important one this state is facing for the next several decades, and it is certainly good to have you all here giving us a hand in this operation. He turned the meeting over to Ms. Crawley who stated participants would now hear from three individuals from the Impact Analysis Committee. Ms. Beth Collins, Co-Chair of the Impact Analysis Committee and Director of Research, RI, Economic Policy Council, with Mr. Rich Blodgett, Providence Water Supply Board. Ms. Julie Lundgren, Conservation Scientist with the Nature Conservancy, will also talk about an in-depth committee project.

### **F. Impact Analysis Committee**

### **Ms. Beth Collins, Co-Chair**

Ms. Collins reported that the committee worked very hard and came up with two main recommendations to optimize social and economic impacts, and these two made the "21 Priority" recommendations. The committee worked on several issues and the final recommendations were not obvious until the committee understood the essential relationship of water to land. Water must be essentially tied to land-use decisions. The first recommendation falls under the category of information and analysis that includes stream flow gaging, safe yield, etc. These information pieces are very critical, and the committee recommends a build-out analysis in conjunction with some of the local communities and the regional organizations, cities and towns. It is recommended building regulations that optimize long-term capacity for water resource management be developed and implemented. She noted there is a large gap between the information available now and what is needed in order to incorporate the consideration of water availability into the local planning process and ordinances.

Ms. Collins reported the committee has submitted a final report but may conduct a build-out analysis. Therefore, the second recommendation is to establish standards, priorities, and protocols to protect the natural environment from excessive water withdrawals. Priority habitats need to be identified to protect at a higher standard. The committee found that healthy ecosystems and water resource management provide economic value to states though quantifying the values is difficult. Thus, prioritization becomes extremely important for optimizing long term social and economic benefits so the question becomes how can Rhode Islander's live within a water budget. It is important to the State that water scarcity does not hamper RI's economic growth. RI is highly developed state and this has already significantly affected the hydrologic value of the state. Thus, it becomes important to bring technical assistance and information to the local municipalities for improved water and land-use decision-making. In terms of the build-out analysis, it is proposed that a stressed basin pilot be conducted (Blackstone River Basin) to further define and ask questions about land use planning.

Ms. Julie Lundgren presented information on a Nature Conservancy project that is relevant to the work of the committee. She stated that the opportunity to work on issues that affect all of us has been wonderful. The pulling together of information and building consensus on issues, concepts and priorities has been useful and important to RI systems, and the Nature Conservancy will be moving ahead on some of these issues including work with the Wood River and the Pawcatuck rivers

#### **G. Out-of-Basin Transfer Committee**

#### **Mr. Kevin Cute, Chair**

Mr. Kevin Cute, Marine Specialist, Coastal Resources Management Center, and Committee Chair of the Out-of-Basin Transfer Committee reported the committee has two management and regulation recommendations – establish a statewide permit system and a pre-application review process. He noted the committee strongly believes the state needs a water permitting system that addresses all water uses and includes out-of-basin transfer as a chief criterion for decisions. Basic principles that the committee felt were important included, water quantity, water accounting systems (i.e. NEWUDDS) for reasonable use within a basin, and minimum stream flow standards. Mr. Cute to acknowledged the work of Ms. Meg Kerr and the Rivers Council who have developed the capacity at the local level that would support the decision-making at the state level. The goal of a water permit system should be twofold: fair allocation of water resources to all user groups and protection of the existing water supply. Therefore, the need for information on the existing supply is most important. What the committee would like to see answered concerning the water supply are the following questions: what are the actual uses of the states water resources including wastewater which brings a conservation element into our overall recommendation. The committee recommends that a permit system occur over time, after sufficient information has been analyzed on the water resources by basin. During the phase in process, we recommend discouraging out-of-basin transfer until a proper system has been established. Our second recommendation to develop a pre-application review process supports our first recommendation, and in a sense, drives it. The current Zoning Enabling Act and Land Development and Review Enabling Act both have pre-application elements, and we recommend incorporating water resources into the existing legislation and regulatory requirements. Perhaps a consortium of existing agencies would be the review committee. The review criteria could include a predetermined (gallons per day) threshold by basin; include environmental, economic, and social issues in the determination, and a determination of the significance of a project (i.e. categories setting the level of review). Finally, the committee recommended that a water-use registration system be implemented but this recommendation did not make the “21 Priority” recommendations.

#### **H. Water Rights Committee**

#### **Dr. Dale Thompson, Chair**

Dr. Dale Thompson, Associate Visiting Professor of Law, Roger Williams University and Chair of the Water Rights Committee, presented the recommendations of the Water Rights Committee. Mr.

Thompson thanked the members of the committee and the WRB staff for their work. He stated that the committee developed several recommendations that are referenced in detail in a report that includes text and detailed footnotes should be read in order to understand the complexity of water rights issues. The committee was charged to look at regulatory authority and water rights of the state. The committee recommends establishing a working group composed of multiple agencies and organizations to draft a framework and regulations for a water rights program. Decisions should be made in a more integrated and coordinated manner. In terms of water rights, the committee recommends removing the water rights reasonable use decisions from the courts to a central authority, an administrative agency, that would prove water availability, modify the water rights structure and to determine reasonable use. This supports the idea that waters are a natural resource that are owned by the state in trust for the public. He noted that the farming community rejects this notion but that the US Supreme Court has established precedent when U.S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, a champion of property rights, held in *Hudson County Water Co. v. McCarter*,

“[F]ew public interests are more obvious, indisputable and independent of particular theory than the interest of the public of a State to maintain rivers that are wholly within it substantially undiminished, except by such drafts upon them as the guardian of the public welfare may permit for the purpose of turning them to a more perfect use. This public interest is omnipresent wherever there is a State, and grows more pressing as population grows. It is fundamental, and we are of the opinion that the private property of riparian proprietors cannot be supposed to have deeper roots. ... The private right to appropriate is subject not only to the rights of lower owners but to the initial limitation that it may not substantially diminish one of the great foundations of public welfare and health.” 209 U.S. 349, 356 (1908), cited in Joseph Sax, Barton Thompson, Jr., John Leshy, & Robert Abrams, Legal Control of Water Resources, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 539 (2000). .

Dr. Thompson noted that it is essential for the State as the owner in trust for the public to take steps to protect the public interest by coming up with a system to do so. Information on water use and water supply is necessary for rational decision-making. A “priority” of use decision must be made that includes human consumption, and sanitation and agriculture as second. Some priorities may shift based on tourism, hospitals, etc. Therefore, the committee made six recommendations on managing the water resources, and these recommendations are discussed in detail in the committee report.

## **I. Rates Committee**

### **Ms. Jean Bondarevskis, Chair**

Ms. Jean Bondarevskis, Finance Director, Providence Water Supply Board, and Chair of the Water Rates Committee presented the committee recommendations that include the establishment of a working group to further develop and review the many concepts that have been identified. She noted it is important to continue discussion on the “what and how and funding needs” of the committee recommendations. She noted the importance to maintain a level of support for data/information systems and a technical assistance program for local water suppliers. The committee recommends that the WRB consider a water allocation fee for all water users to be used to support the water allocation program. The committee recommended that this fee be equitable and tied to a chargeable service or benefit for public and private users. The details of this fee would need to be developed. The committee recommended that the water allocation elements be identified for the initiative so that a fee structure could be phased in to support the elements. It was also recommended that a feasibility analysis occur regarding program implementation that would include public water suppliers (29 and relevant data, minor water suppliers (340), and private suppliers. It was recommended that the fee be divided to provide a percentage to the water suppliers and to the WRB to support the local and state be obtained from the water quality protection fund. The committee reviewed various rates, surcharges, and fees and found that seasonal rates are difficult to implement without accurate meter reading. For example, a drought surcharge could be implemented to support the

water supplier's loss of income during a drought. The committee recommended the elimination of flat or fixed water and sewer rates in favor of a volumetric rate fee to tie usage to volume, and supports water conservation efforts. It is possible that lower rates could be charged to those who reuse water but this idea would need to be explored further. It is recommended the WRB encourage water suppliers to standardize the language in the water bills. Water bills could be designed similar to electric bills so customers will know exactly what they are paying for and what their actual water consumption is per household for a particular period of time (quarterly billing is recommended although this will incur additional expenses related to meter reading for the water supplier). The standardized water bill should include a comment section where conservation announcements could be made. Finally, the committee recommends that a robust conservation education program be implemented.

## **J. The “Just Do It” Recommendations**

**Ms. Connie McGreavy, WRB Staff**

Ms. Connie McGreavy, Program Officer, WRB, discussed the “Just Do It” recommendations developed by the various committees and summarized in the Thematic Findings handout. She noted these recommendations were developed after grouping the original 84 recommendations according to major themes (state policy, plans, legislation or regulation), and it quickly became apparent that these recommendations can be easily accomplished. These recommendations do not require legislation but do involve modifying the State Guide Plan or existing regulation and would require a coordinated effort among various agencies—primarily, DOA, DEM, CRMC and the WRB—to update and make more consistent state policies and regulations. For example, some policy statements such as “State Leadership for municipal planning”, and “joint management of land use and water” could occur by revising the SGP element for water to reflect the land use connections and by integrating new or revised water management goals, policies, and strategies into SGP element 121, Land Use Policies and Plan. Other areas where water law has been modified includes establishing priority uses of water and regulating out-of-basin transfer of water. She stated her interest in posting much of the accumulated WAPAC information on the web for easy access throughout the state.

Ms. Crawley thanked Ms. McGreavy and all WAPAC Sub-Committee Chairs for the morning presentations on the WAPAC recommendations. She noted that the WRB Strategic Committee would now break for lunch and reconvene for a question and answer session during the afternoon. Participants were reminded to submit comments and questions regarding the WAPAC recommendations to her to assist in focusing the afternoon discussions. Ms. O’Keefe was asked to distribute and collect the comment cards.

## **Lunch Break: 12:00 – 1:00 PM**

### **Afternoon Session Summary of Major Comments**

**Educating municipal officials** (elected and non-elected, planners, planning councils, zoning boards, etc.)

- On-going education of municipal officials is important
- A link with watershed organizations would be valuable (knowledgeable re: water issues and trained, some joint work has been done between watershed councils and local governments already)
- Grow Smart RI has also done training of local officials regarding environmental and conservation issues
- The URI Co-Operative Extension has a number of education, outreach and training programs in place already

### **Streamflow**

- Delays in implementing an ABF (Massachusetts already has a program); not enough progress
- Clearly need the funding for it and the maintaining of existing streamgages.
- The RIABF needs to be further evaluated
- Preferred stream flow would be based on stream characteristics (i.e. what ecological and other factors are at stake?)
- Makes sense to identify priority natural resources
- Residential uses should not have pre-emptive rights over farming, for example.

### **Water / Wastewater**

- Need a discussion of possible thresholds for requiring a water reuse plan to be developed.
- Cross connection concerns should be addressed in any water/wastewater reuse/recycling project.

### **Priority Uses**

- How are priority use areas identified to be protected?
- Does the WRB or the Legislature have to adopt priority uses?
- Just because residential is proposed in an area should not mean that they get the water over an existing use
- Proposed alternate language by TNC for recommendation #15

### **Impact Analysis**

- Need to look at build out analysis on a watershed basis not just cities and towns (this was done for the Blackstone watershed)
- Don't always have data in a digital format for doing the build out analysis (only about 14 towns have done this)
- Need to enact ordinance and incorporate into comprehensive plans requirements for doing water based analysis
- Many local communities do build out analysis
- For the Massachusetts and Blackstone build out analysis, it was not done on a parcel basis – different ways of doing this analysis are available

### **Water Rights**

- RI Water Use is based on the concept that use has to be reasonable. One user cannot use all the water without taking into consideration what the needs of other users are.
- Sustainable use was an overarching theme in sub-committee discussions. From an economic standpoint, if users can't be dependent on a certain amount of water then that will not be good from an economic life viewpoint.
- A farmer is at considerable risk right now of having their water taken away from them. A new residential development upstream from a farm could win rights to water over a farm.
- We can debate rights forever but we are all in this together.
- There are two specific court cases: one in 1930-31 (Rose case in East Providence) where the Supreme Court indicated that whatever happens, as a result of contamination of groundwater is just accidental and not compensatable. The fact that the contamination wiped out Mr. Rose's farm for its purposes is just tough luck. In another recent case (10-15 years ago) in Cumberland, the Supreme Court claimed to know all about groundwater and that it was entirely predictable and ruled in an opposite way to the 1930 case. So there are two decisions at the extreme ends of decision making. This does not provide any ability to determine how the court may act in the future.



- Courts are typically reactive; administrative agencies should be proactive (but have not always been that)
- Who would do this in RI (i.e. who would be the administrative authority)?
- Need sound science, watershed analysis and good information; need to make a program meaningful
- Need to make certain that water rights do not apply only to drought situations; a system need to act before that situation occurs
- Implementation of water use planning needs to be on a local level and moved to a watershed basis. Perhaps having a watershed master with legal authority who would work with the towns to review plans, educate and protect the resources.

### **Out Of Basin Transfer**

- This needs the review of an interdisciplinary team
- Need agencies to work together
- A permit system is the ultimate regulatory tool after you have data on which to make a judgment.
- Need to rethink the system. You want to keep the water in the basin. You need to set up a system whereby you re-distribute within the basin.
- Water data is essential
- Do not support something that is centrally controlled.
- State has not taken the OOB issue seriously.
- Models are necessary but unfortunately are too complex for just anyone to use.
- The challenge with regard to models and their use is establishing appropriate technology (don't over do it)
- Towns need and want the best water information possible to assist them in decision making

### **Permitting**

- Not certain if permitting and the pre-application process is the way to go
- Do not see how a reporting system is a benefit to the farming community. We would be better off with a voluntary system that uses water use coefficients and NRCS has these coefficients now.
- It is a dereliction of duty for the WRB NOT to go forward with a water registration system program. This program would be subject to the state rule making process.
- After 18 months, a threshold should be able to be put on the table. It could be a self-certification program.
- Planning is the only way to protect the resources for all of us. Planning and permitting do not have to be negative or restrictive.

### **Rates**

- Fees collected should be put in a restricted account

### **The Working Group**

- The purpose of the Working Group is to further refine and add to the recommendations made thus far.
- The Working Group should include a representation of public and private representatives.

### **Miscellaneous**

- Need to move forward
- Governance of the system needs to be reviewed, assessed and defined
- Legislative participation is missing

- Regulation is not always restrictive; regulations can be established to be able to get data. Without data, you cannot do very much.
- We need to get “buy in” from the public. I do not see people making an issue of water availability in Rhode Island now.
- The WAPAC process has not had business input
- We need another storage reservoir in the state

#### **The WAPAC Process**

- WRB should be credited for starting and continuing a process that included everybody.
- The WRB should be commended on trying to get public input but it has not gotten input from businesses
- No one can say that the recommendations were “rammed down anyone’s throat.”
- Do not see the problem; do not see the urgency for a program, regulations or permits.
- Is there going to be a day when you say to me that you cannot irrigate your crops and, if so, are you going to compensate me for that restriction?
- The goal is to prevent the day that a scenario like that (no water available) would happen. If we cannot prevent it, we should make this a very rare case. You need good data to do this. You need a system that people can have faith in.
- Compensation is a good issue that may require legislative action.

#### **Dan Varin’s Closing comments**

- Supplemental supply study has just been completed
- Ipswich River example: It was evident that there was no water available. The river had dried up. In that type of situation, everyone will quickly agree that there is a problem.
- We need to find a manageable system to manage the resource.
- We will need to resolve the issues of today
- We have received some conflicting advice and will work on this in the February WRB meeting
- We have talked about using the watershed approach and making latest technology available centrally – the WRB is interested in this type of thing
- Thank you to the great staff for providing this opportunity

Respectfully submitted,

Juan Mariscal

Beverly O’Keefe